

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings includes changes to Figures 1 and 2. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which includes Figures 1 and 2, will replace the original sheets including Figures 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets", Applicant has replaced the terms "8G-N" and "N" in Fig. 1 with the term "4G", and has amended the unrecognizable symbols before "B" to "Δ" in Fig 2. No new matter has been added to the drawings.

SPECIFICATION

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. The Examiner considers the "two" in [0005], on 2nd line incorrect compared to the "thirty" in [0004], 6th line. Applicant has amended the specification, by replacing the phrase "two 100M Ethernet process boards" with the phrase "two Ethernet process boards each support a plurality of 100M Ethernets", to clarify the its meaning. The "two" refers to two boards. The "thirty" refers to thirty 100M Ethernets. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Svacek et al. (US Pub No. 2002/0163937 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is directed to an apparatus for dynamic allocation of slot bandwidth includes N slots, $B/\Delta B$ pieces of N-selected-one devices, and a main switch module. The claimed invention implements dynamic allocation of slot bandwidth by hardware, e.g., the $B/\Delta B$ pieces of N-selected-one devices and the main control module.

The allocation of bandwidth in Svacek at best appears to be performed by software in a cross-connect module (Svacek, Fig. 3). The microprocessor of Svacek programs the allocation module. The allocation module then allocates bandwidth to the personality modules placed in the slots (page 2, paragraph [0013]). Svacek fails to anticipate the N-selected-one devices and the main switch module for controlling the N-selected-one devices to allocate the bandwidth to communicated slots.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that the $B/\Delta B$ pieces of N-selected-one devices are anticipated by the module in [0025] of Svacek. The modules in [0025] of Svacek at best appear to be personality modules inserted in the slots (Svacek, [0025], lines 3~5). In other words, they appear to be the modules to which the bandwidth is allocated.

Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that the " ΔB " is anticipated by the "number of parallel bits to each slot" in [0012] of Svacek. Applicant submits that the " ΔB " in claim 6 denotes a minimum allocated bandwidth unit. The bandwidth actually allocated to each slot may be any multiple of ΔB depending on the $B/\Delta B$ pieces of N-selected-one devices. For example, if two of the N-selected-one devices allocate bandwidth to one particular slot, the bandwidth allocated to the slot is $2 * \Delta B$. In contrast, the "number of parallel bits to each slot" in [0012] of Svacek at best appears to be the bandwidth required by each module in the slot (Svacek, [0012], lines 9~11).

In view of foregoing, claim 6 and its dependant claims 7-8 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claim 1, its dependent claims 2-5, and claim 9 also define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 29, 2007

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata
Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/jks